

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,611		11/28/2003	Richard A. Soref	AFB00670	7471
29922	29922 7590 10/12/2004 EXAMINER			INER	
ESC/JAZ				WILSON, A	ALLAN R
U.S. AIR FO 40 WRIGHT				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HANSCOM		MA 01731		2815	

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
o .	10/722,611	SOREF ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Allan R. Wilson	2815				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 M	arch 2004.					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers		•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 2815

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 5,548,128. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because for example, the structure of the present Application's claim 1 is disclosed in the '128 patent's claim 16.

#### Claim Objections

Claims 1, 2 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1 and 10, last line, the term "and/or" is confusing.

Claim 2, 11 and 12, should end in a period.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2815

Claims 4-6 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claims cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 4-6 have not been further treated on the merits.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Luryi U.S. Patent No. 4,769,341 in view of Nakagawa et al. ("Nakagawa") U.S. Patent No. 5,523,592.

With regards to claim 1, Luryi illustrates in figures 1-4, particularly figure 1, (entire document) (a) a silicon substrate1,

- (b) a strain-relaxed Ge<sub>1-y</sub>Sn<sub>y</sub> or Ge<sub>1-y-z</sub>Sn<sub>y</sub>Si<sub>z</sub> buffer layer upon Si, known as a virtual substrate, VS
- (c) an active direct-bandgap region made up of a single-quantum-well heterostructure or a multi -quantum-well stack,
- (d) a strain-relieved capping layer of Ge<sub>1-y</sub>Sn<sub>y</sub> or Ge<sub>1-y-z</sub>Sn<sub>y</sub>Si<sub>z</sub> matching the VS composition.

Luryi does not show a metallic electrical contacts to the Si substrate or capping layer.

Nakagawa illustrates in figure 7e metallic electrical contacts 138, 139 to the Si substrate 131 and

Art Unit: 2815

capping layer 136. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have metallic electrical contacts to make contact with the device.

With regards to claim 2, Nakagawa illustrates in fig. 7e the substrate 131 is doped N-type while the capping layer 136 is doped P-type to form an NIP diode. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Luryi to make the substrate N-type and capping layer P-type to make a NIP diode.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Noel et al. (illustrates a QW area could be GeSn).

Art Unit: 2815

Field of Search	Date
U.S. Class and subclass:	*
257/14, 15, 21, 22	7 October 2004
Other Documentation:	
None	N/A
Electronic data base(s):	
EAST (USPAT, US-PGPUB, JPO, EPO, Derwent, IBM TDB)	7 October 2004

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from an examiner should be directed to Primary Examiner Allan Wilson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1738. Examiner Wilson can normally be reached 7:00-4:00 Monday-Thursday and 6:00-3:00 on Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-1664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Allan R. Wilson Primary Examiner 7 October 2004